



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the present time, although it is seldom found in the literature of to-day. In Modern French translations of the Bible, however, where old forms and constructions are preserved, *tout le jour* is used regularly.

### 3. ORIGIN OF *toute la journée*.

When *jor* took the place of *dis*, it was, of course, used in all the constructions in which *dis* had been used. Later, however, when a desire was felt to differentiate more in the meaning of words by limiting their use to certain phrases, *journée* supplanted *jor* in the adverb in question. The reason for the substitution of *journée* for *jor* in *toute la journée* is due to the fact that *journée* expresses the exact idea contained in this phrase. The primary meaning of *journée* is that of duration, and, as this is the meaning expressed in the phrase 'all day,' it is natural that it should be used here. A similar tendency is seen in the case of *an* and *année*. In the Old French one used *tot l'an*,<sup>30</sup> while the regular form in Modern French is *toute l'année*.<sup>31</sup>

OLIVER M. JOHNSTON.

Leland Stanford, Jr., University.

### OTHER DOUBTFUL WORDS IN SWEET'S DICTIONARY OF ANGLO-SAXON.

*geloda* means according to Sweet not only 'joint of the backbone,' but also 'brother.'

As to *geloda* 'joint of the backbone,' I do not wish to enter into a discussion just now. The entry apparently is based on *WW*. 159, 22 *spondilia geloda vel gelyndu*, with which compare *Ahd.*

*Gl.* III, 431, 21 *spondilia rukebein*.

431, 22 *spina gelenda*.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Chrétien de Troies, *op. cit.*, I. 2674:

Sel fist si bian mes sire Yvains  
Tot l'an, que mes sire Gauvains  
Se penoit de lui enorer  
Et si le fist tant demorer  
Que trestoz li anz fu passez.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Émile Souvestre, *Un Philosophe sous les Toits*. Ed. by W. H. Fraser, Boston, 1897, II, p. 9: Obligés toute l'année à la décence, à l'ordre, au bon sens, nous nous dédommageons, pendant le carnaval, d'une longue contrainte.

In regard to *geloda* 'brother,' however, it is easy to see that Sweet has failed to perceive that *WW*. 173, 44 *fratres gebroðru uel gelodan uel siblingas*, on which he evidently bases his entry, contains a slight mistake that might have been rectified by reference to *WW*. 410, 34-36 *fratres gebropor et aliquando gemægas, aliquando gelondan, quas Latini paternitates interpretantur*. This is confirmed by *Ahd. Gl.* III, 423, 21-23, *Fratres de patre nati. aliquando gelandan. quos Latini paternitates appellant (interpretantur: b)*, with which compare *WW*. 211, 19-21, *contribulus. i. ciues consanguineus mæg, gelanda, parens, gesib propinquus uel simul tribulatus*. On the strength of the latter gloss, Sweet has *gelanda* 'fellow-countryman, kinsman,' of which *gelonda*, written *gelōda*, is, of course, a by-form. As to the omission of the *n*-stroke compare *WW*. 204, 33 *circinnus gafelrod for gafelrōd*; *ibid.* 64, 7 *occasionem intigan for intīgan*; *ibid.* 66, 16 *inebriabitur bit drucen for drūcen*; *VP*. 29, 5 *memoriae gemydde for gemȳdde*; *ibid.* 30, 11 *paupertate ðearfednisse for ðearfēdnisse*; *ibid.* 32, 2 *in cythara in citra for citrā*; *ibid.* 34, 11 *sterititas unbeorednisse unbeorēdnisse*; *ibid.* 72, 25 *to lafe stodeð for stōdeð*; *ibid.* 93, 5 *vexauerunt swecton for swēcton*; *Corpus Glossary* (ed. Hessels) G 115 *glomer clouue for clouuē*; Q 27 *quadrare geeblicadun for geeblicadun*; *Erfurt (C. G. L. v. 365, 26) indruticans uraesgendi for uurāēsgendi*.<sup>1</sup> The point raised by Sievers (*Anglia* XIV, 143) that the use of the contraction mark to denote a simple *n* is very rare in OE. has already been shown to be untenable by the proofs given (which might easily be increased) *ex absentia*. Direct testimony is afforded by the following instances: *Old English Glosses* (ed. A. Napier) 10, 4 *naptarum tūdar*; *Durh. Rit.* p. 13 *benignitatem weldōnis*; *ibid.* p. 23 *culparum sȳna*; *ibid.* p. 36 *incursione onerrȳge*; *ibid.* p. 119 *latrinibus firȳðeafv* (a notable instance); p. 122 *invocationem inceiginge* (cp. *innceigungv* p. 121); *ibid.* p. 193 *centurio hondrað mōn latwv*; *decanus tea mōn latwv*. Add to that the instances quoted by Napier (note to 1,300), *lilā for lilan, cumē for cumen*; *i for in*. An apparently well-authenticated word is *gefyrðra* 'promoter', if we go by the way Sweet prints it. Yet

<sup>1</sup> *Epinal-Corpus* have wrongly *uuraestendi (wraestende)* which Holthausen vainly tries to defend. Also Kluge recognizes a *wrēnsian* 'geil sein.'

it rests only on a supposition, viz. that in the *Erfurt-Corpus-Gloss* (Hessels, D 266) *ditōr*, *gefyrdō* we have to do with a noun, not—as would seem evident to any but a prejudiced mind—with a verb form. Sweet must have taken *ditōr* as equivalent to *ditator*; his present *gefyrdō* is an improvement on the *gefyrdō* 'promoter' we find in the glossary to *OET*. Goetz in his *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum* correctly explains the word by German '*ich fördere*', but fails to refer to the source of the gloss, Aldhelm's Riddle *De Archuro* l. 7 *hoc dono ditōr*, etc., whence it would seem that *gefyrdō* was originally *gefyrdōd* sc. *beom*. Also on a supposition is based Sweet's entry *wuduheñn* 'quail'. We read in *Corpus C.* 840 *coturno wodhae*. This appears wrongly (cp. Wülker's note) as *coturno wodhæn* *WW.* 366, 2. But imagining *coturno* as being = *coturnix*, Sweet accepted *wodhæn* and took it to be for *wuduhen* which he prints as authentic in his *Dictionary*, giving the reader not even a hint as to the doubtfulness of the entry. I think we shall not go amiss in referring the gloss to Aldhelm's *Epistola ad Acircium* (Giles, p. 264, l. 8) *versu et facundiae cothurno extulerunt*; *wodhae* then will stand for *woð wōp* evidently being used here in the sense of 'stilted (artificial) speech.' Thus *coturnus* appears glossed by Irish *sulbair* 'eloquence' in the *Cod. Augustini Carolinrh.*, fol. 35<sup>b</sup>. Probably to the same passage of Aldhelm is to be referred the Münster gloss *coturno crince* (*ZfdA.* 33, 242), and *crinc* will rather mean '*gewundene, gekünstelte Rede* than *gewundener Schuh*, as Kluge would have it.

In the preface to his *OET*. Sweet had drawn attention to the monstrous *borggilefde* glossing *vadimonium* in the *Corpus*, but to this monstrosity he actually gives a place in his *Dictionary*, not heeding the clear testimony of Epinal-Erfurt reading *uerecundiae concesserim gilebdae* and *uadimonium borg* as to two distinct words. *Gilefde*, of course, renders only *concesserim*, the gloss referring to *Oros.* III, 3, 3.

That there is no such verb as *pritiġean* 'chirp', has already been pointed out by Napier, note to *OEG.* 37, 3 *garrulantes wri[tiende]*. But we may well ask why Sweet turned aside Kluge's testimony as to the MS. reading *writigeað* (*pipant*) *WW.* 516, 24 (see *E. S.* XI, 512) and why he paid no

attention to the by-form *wreotian* pointed out by the same author as extant in *WW.* 377, 33 *crepitat wreotaþ*. The question is all the more pertinent as Hall's *Dictionary* gives *wreotan* = *writian* and explains the latter by 'to rush, to roar.'

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Wolfenbüttel, Germany.

## ROMANIC LEXICOGRAPHICAL MISCELLANIES.

Under this heading are gathered various French, Italian, or Provençal words. Some of them are either not registered in the lexicons, or they are ill-defined, or, again, they have seemed to me to have been treated inadequately or erroneously from an etymological point of view.

*Agacer, agazzare, taquiner.*

AGAZA, Old High German, "daw". See O. Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 2d ed. *Agaza*, rather than the *agalstra* cited as a possibility by Hatzfeld and Darmesteter in the *Dictionnaire Général*, is almost certainly the etymon of the French *agacer* and of the Italian *agazzare*. Tommaseo cites *agazza* and refers to *agazza* and *gazzera*. He does not cite *agazzare*. Muratori, *Rer. Ital. Serip.*, t. XVI, col. 1035, cites the following from the account of the burial of Galeazzo of Milan, September, 1402: "alia duo [scuta] cum divisa Imperatoris, videlicet uno capitergio cum una gassa." I shall quote one earlier passage for the Italian. Körting reads thus in his second edition: "Über das Vb. *agacer* s. oben *ad* + *hazjan*; zu *agaza* gehört *agacer* nur insofern, als es altfranzösisch auch 'wie eine Elster schreien' bedeutet; *agacer*, 'reizen,' ist *ad* + *ahd. hazjan*, 'hetzen';" etc. On the contrary, both *agacer* and *agazzare* are, I believe, to be derived from OHG. *agaza*, "daw," and both these verbs were at first terms of falconry. The *Dictionnaire Général* defines *agacer* as follows:—(1) Mettre dans un état de légère irritation nerveuse:—(2) Exciter par de légères provocations.

Now as to the evidence. To say nothing of the very serious phonetic difficulties to which both *hazjan* and *hatzan* give rise, there is excellent ground for seeking elsewhere the etymon of *agacer*